UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,750	09/22/2003	David J. Lillie	03SW198/ALBRP318US	1899

7590   06/07/2007

Susan M. Donahue
Rockwell Automation
704-P, IP Department
1201 South 2nd Street
Milwaukee, WI 53204

EXAMINER
STACE, BRENT S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/667,750
Filing Date: September 22, 2003
Appellant(s): LILLIE ET AL.

MAILED

JUN 0 7 2007

Technology Center 2100

Himanshu S. Amin
<u>For Appellant</u>

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 2/27/2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 9/28/2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is incorrect.

The amendments after final rejections filed on 11/20/2006 and 12/27/2006 have been entered.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

2003/0163513	Schaeck et al.	08-2003
20010011341	Hayes Jr. et al.	08-2001
6,115,709	Gilmour et al.	09-2000
6,026,397	Sheppard, Colin P.	02-2000
5,813,007	Nielsen, Jakob	09-1998

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the appellant for a patent.
(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the appellant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the appellant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 8-14, 16, 17, 20-22, 24, 26-28, and 30-38 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(a) and 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application

Publication No. 2003/0163513 (Schaeck et al.).

Claim 1 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "A system that employs a shared

access profile to interact with at least one networked device, [Schaeck, paragraph

[0020]] comprising:

- a storage component that is utilized to save one or more shared access profiles customized to delineate at least one of access and administrative privileges to the at least one networked device; [Schaeck, paragraphs [0022], [0066], and [0067]]

- a retrieval component that obtains the shared access profile from the storage component, [Schaeck, paragraphs [0066]-[0068]] and

- a user interface that employs the shared access profile to provide the users having similar roles with selective access to the at least one networked device" [Schaeck, paragraph [0044] with Schaeck, paragraphs [0066]-[0068]].

Claim 2 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 1, the shared access profile associated with a predetermined user role" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0022] and [0067]].

Claim 3 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 1, the shared access profile is one of a default and a user customized profile" [Schaeck, paragraph [0068]].

Claim 4 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 1, the shared access profile is associated with one or more attributes comprising a read, a write and an execute attribute" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0081], [0066], [0073], and [0075]-[0076]].

Claim 8 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 1, multiple instances of the shared access profile are instantiated within the user interface wherein

the user can toggle between instances or partition the user interface to concurrently view more than one instance" [Schaeck, paragraph [0073]].

Claim 9 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 1, multiple instances of the shared access profile are instantiated by a plurality of users with the user role within at least one of the user interface and other user interfaces" [Schaeck, paragraph [0073]].

Claim 10 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 1, the user interface is a portal with one or more portlets" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0033]-[0034], [0037], [0044]].

Claim 11 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 1, employed in an industrial environment" [Schaeck, paragraph [0068]].

Claim 12 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "A system that provides a user with access to components on a network, [Schaeck, paragraph [0020]] comprising:

- a loading component that launches a shared portal configuration having at least one of customized access and administrative privileges associated with a user role, [Schaeck, paragraphs [0022] with Schaeck, paragraph [0044] with Schaeck, paragraphs [0066]-[0068]] and

- one or more portlets that are respectively associated with the networked components, [Schaeck, paragraphs [0033]-[0034], [0037], [0044]] the portlets reside within the portal [Schaeck, paragraph [0073]] and provide users having similar roles with access to the components based on the shared portal

configuration" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0066]-[0068] with Schaeck, paragraph [0073]].

Claim 13 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 12, the shared portal configuration is concurrently utilized by one or more users associated with the user role" [Schaeck, paragraph [0073]].

Claim 14 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 12, further comprising a utility to modify and save the shared portal configuration" [Schaeck, paragraph [0066]].

Claim 16 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 12, further comprising intelligence to automatically select and load the shared portal configuration" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0068], [0080], and [0082]].

Claim 17 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 16, the intelligence utilizes at least one of a statistic, a probability, an inference and a classifier to facilitate selecting the shared portal configuration for the user" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0068], [0080], and [0082]].

Claim 20 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 12, the portal is a graphical user interface including one of a web browser, a web page and a home page" [Schaeck, paragraph [0073] with Schaeck, paragraph [0006]].

Claim 21 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "A method for employing a shared portal configuration, [Schaeck, paragraph [0020]] comprising:

- selecting a shared portal configuration; [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0068], [0080], and [0082]]

- loading the shared portal configuration to instantiate one or more portlets within the portal; [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0068], [0073], [0080], and [0082]]

- associating the one or more portlets with respective networked components, to provide selective access to one or more components to users having a similar role; [Schaeck, paragraphs [0022], [0037], [0044], [0066], [0067], and [0076]] and

- employing the one or more portlets to access the networked components" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0037], [0044], and [0076]].

Claim 22 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The method of claim 21, the shared portal configuration selected from a set of shared configurations that are associated with a user role" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0066]-[0068], and [0080]].

Claim 24 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 21, further comprising employing at least one of a statistic, a probability, an inferences and a classifier to facilitate selecting the shared portal configuration" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0068], [0080], and [0082]].

Claim 26 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "A method for customizing and saving a shared portal configuration, [Schaeck, paragraphs [0066]-[0068]] comprising:

- logging on to a portal; [Schaeck, paragraphs, [0081], [0059], [0067], and [0006]]

- initializing a portal configuration; [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0066]-[0068], [0073], [0080], and [0082]]

- customizing the portal configuration to include predetermined access and

  administrative privileges, based on a user role; [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020],

  [0022], [0053], [0066]-[0068], [0073], [0080], and [0082]]

- defining the portal configuration as a shared configuration, [Schaeck, paragraph

  [0073]] and

- saving the portal configuration" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0066]-[0068]].

Claim 27 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The method of claim 26, the

initialized portal configuration is an existing configuration or a new configuration"

[Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0066]-[0068], [0073], [0080], and [0082]].

Claim 28 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The method of claim 26, further

customizing the configuration by at least one of adding, removing and editing portlets"

[Schaeck, paragraphs [0037], [0073], and [0080]].

Claim 30 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The method of claim 26, further

customizing the configuration by associating networked components with the portlets"

[Schaeck, paragraphs [0037], [0044], [0073], [0075]-[0078], and [0080]-[0083]].

Claim 31 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The method of claim 26, saving

the shared configuration to at least one of a storage location local to the portal, a

common storage location on the network and a storage location associated with another

portal" [Schaeck, paragraph [0066] and [0081]].

Claim 32 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The method of claim 26, further

comprising employing at least one of a statistic, a probability, an inference, Bayesian

learning, a Bayesian classifier, decision tree learning, a support vector machine, a linear

regression, a non-linear regression and a neural network to facilitate customization"
[Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0068], [0080], and [0082]].

Claim 33 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "A system for employing a
shared portal configuration to access components on a network, [Schaeck, paragraph
[0020]] comprising:

- means for selecting a shared portal configuration having customized access and
  administrative priviledges from one or more configurations associated with a user
  role; [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0066]-[0068], [0080], and [0082]]

- means for invoking the shared portal configuration, the invocation instantiating
  portlets [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0068], [0073], [0080], and [0082]]
  and associating selected networked components with the portlets; [Schaeck,
  paragraphs [0037], [0044], [0073], [0075]-[0078], and [0080]-[0083]] and

- means for employing the portlets to access the networked components, the
  networked components associated with the users role" [Schaeck, paragraphs
  [0037], [0044], and [0076]].

Claim 34 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "An API that generates a
shared portal configuration in a computer readable medium, [Schaeck, paragraphs
[0020] and [0034]] comprising:

- instructions for instantiating a portal configuration; [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020],
  [0053], [0066]- [0068], [0073], [0080], and [0082]]

- instructions for defining the portal configuration to have at least one of customized access and administrative priviledges for a user role, [Schaeck, paragraphs [0022] and [0066]-[0068]] and

- instructions for saving the portal configuration as a shared configuration" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0066]-[0068] with [0073]].

Claim 35 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The API of claim 34, further comprising instructions for utilizing a .NET or SDK API" [Schaeck, paragraph [0034]].

Claim 36 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The API of claim 34, further comprising instructions for associating one or more of a read, a write and an execute attribute with the portal configuration" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0081], [0066], [0073], and [0075]-[0076]].

Claim 37 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The API of claim 34, further comprising instructions for adding, removing and editing a portlet associated with the portal" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0080], [0073]-[0074], and [0043]].

Claim 38 can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The API of claim 37, further comprising instructions for associating a component with the portlet" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0037], [0044], [0073], [0075]-[0078], and [0080]-[0083]].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Appellant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 5, 7, 19, 23, 29, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163513 (Schaeck et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0011341 (Hayes Jr. et al.).

For **Claim 5**, Schaeck teaches: "The system of claim 1, further comprising."

Schaeck discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "an update component that notifies the user when the shared access profile changes and refreshes the user interface with the changed shared access profile upon a user approval."

With respect to Claim 5, an analogous art, Hayes Jr., teaches: "an update component that notifies the user when the shared access profile changes and refreshes the user interface with the changed shared access profile upon a user approval" [Hayes Jr., paragraph [0061]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Hayes Jr. with Schaeck because both inventions are directed towards profiles and portals.

Hayes Jr.'s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Schaeck's invention because both inventions use profiles and portals. Schaeck discloses providing role-based views from business web portals, however Schaeck does not expressly disclose notification of a changed to the shared access profile with automatic refreshing. Hayes Jr. discloses a client-server system from maintaining a user desktop consistent with server application user access permissions comprising notification and allowing automatic refreshing when there is a context change.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the notification and allowance of automatic refreshing from Hayes Jr. and install it into the invention of Schaeck, thereby offering the obvious advantage of updating portals/portlets so that everyone has the most recent/correct data/views.

For **Claim 7**, Schaeck teaches: "The system of claim 1."

Schaeck discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "the shared access profile is automatically updated in the user interface when the shared access profile is modified."

With respect to Claim 7, an analogous art, Hayes Jr., teaches: "the shared access profile is automatically updated in the user interface when the shared access profile is modified" [Hayes Jr., paragraph [0061]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Hayes Jr. with Schaeck because both inventions are directed towards profiles and portals.

Hayes Jr.'s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Schaeck's invention because both inventions use profiles and portals. Schaeck discloses providing role-based views from business web portals, however Schaeck does not expressly disclose automatic refreshing when a profile is modified. Hayes Jr. discloses a client-server system from maintaining a user desktop consistent with server application user access permissions comprising automatic refreshing when there is a context change.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the automatic refreshing from Hayes Jr. and install it into the invention of Schaeck, thereby offering the obvious advantage of updating portals/portlets so that everyone has the most recent/correct data/views.

For **Claim 19**, Schaeck teaches: "The system of claim 12."

Schaeck discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "the shared portal configuration is dynamically refreshed when modified."

With respect to Claim 19, an analogous art, Hayes Jr., teaches: "the shared portal configuration is dynamically refreshed when modified" [Hayes Jr., paragraph [0061]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Hayes Jr. with Schaeck because both inventions are directed towards profiles and portals.

Hayes Jr.'s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Schaeck's invention because both inventions use profiles and portals. Schaeck discloses providing role-based views from business web portals, however Schaeck does not expressly disclose automatic refreshing when a profile is modified. Hayes Jr. discloses a client-server system from maintaining a user desktop consistent with server application user access permissions comprising automatic refreshing when there is a context change.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the automatic refreshing from Hayes Jr. and install it into the invention of Schaeck, thereby offering the obvious advantage of updating portals/portlets so that everyone has the most recent/correct data/views.

For **Claim 23**, Schaeck teaches: "The method of claim 21."

Schaeck discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "the shared portal configuration re-loads within the portal when a change occurs to the shared portal configuration."

With respect to Claim 23, an analogous art, Hayes Jr., teaches: "the shared portal configuration re-loads within the portal when a change occurs to the shared portal configuration" [Hayes Jr., paragraph [0061]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Hayes Jr. with Schaeck because both inventions are directed towards profiles and portals.

Hayes Jr.'s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Schaeck's invention because both inventions use profiles and portals. Schaeck discloses providing role-based views from business web portals, however Schaeck does not expressly disclose automatic refreshing when a profile is modified. Hayes Jr. discloses a client-server system from maintaining a user desktop consistent with server application user access permissions comprising automatic refreshing when there is a context change.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the automatic refreshing from Hayes Jr. and install it into the invention of Schaeck, thereby offering the obvious advantage of updating portals/portlets so that everyone has the most recent/correct data/views.

For **Claim 29**, Schaeck teaches: "The method of claim 26."

Schaeck discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "further customizing the configuration by defining at least one of portlet shape, size, color, rotation, location and opacity."

With respect to Claim 29, an analogous art, Hayes Jr., teaches: "further customizing the configuration by defining at least one of portlet shape, size, color, rotation, location and opacity" [Hayes Jr., paragraph [0044]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Hayes Jr. with Schaeck because both inventions are directed towards portals and portlets.

Hayes Jr.'s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Schaeck's invention because both inventions use portals and portlets. Schaeck discloses providing role-based views from business web portals, however Schaeck does not expressly disclose defining at least one of portlet shape, size, color, rotation, location and opacity. Hayes Jr. discloses a client-server system from maintaining a user desktop consistent with server application user access permissions comprising defining portlet background color.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the portlet background color definition from Hayes Jr. and install it into the invention of Schaeck, thereby offering the obvious advantage of customizing the portlet according to user preferences.

For **Claim 39**, Schaeck teaches: "The API of claim 34, further comprising instructions for."

Schaeck discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "defining at least one of portlet shape, size, color, rotation, location and opacity."

With respect to Claim 39, an analogous art, Hayes Jr., teaches: "defining at least one of portlet shape, size, color, rotation, location and opacity" [Hayes Jr., paragraph [0044]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Hayes Jr. with Schaeck because both inventions are directed towards portals and portlets.

Hayes Jr.'s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Schaeck's invention because both inventions use portals and portlets. Schaeck discloses providing role-based views from business web portals, however Schaeck does not expressly disclose defining at least one of portlet shape, size, color, rotation, location and opacity. Hayes Jr. discloses a client-server system from maintaining a user desktop consistent with server application user access permissions comprising defining portlet background color.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the portlet background color definition from Hayes Jr. and install it into the invention of Schaeck, thereby offering the obvious advantage of customizing the portlet according to user preferences.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163513 (Schaeck et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0011341 (Hayes Jr. et al.), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,813,007 (Nielsen).

For **Claim 6**, Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) teaches: "The system of claim 5."

Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "the notification comprising at least one of a text message and an audio message."

With respect to Claim 6, an analogous art, Nielsen, teaches: "the notification comprising at least one of a text message and an audio message" [Nielsen, col. 10, lines 45-55].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Nielsen with Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) because both inventions are directed towards user notification.

Nielsen's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.)'s invention because both inventions use notifications. Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) discloses providing role-based views from business web portals comprising notifying the user of a context change to allow a refresh to occur, however Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) does not expressly disclose a text or audio notification. Nielsen discloses automatic updates of bookmarks in a client computer comprising dialog notification/indication to a user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the notification technique from Nielsen and install it into the invention of Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.), thereby offering the obvious advantage of allowing the refresh to occur after the dialog notification.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163513 (Schaeck et al.) in view of U.S. Patent

Application Publication No. 2001/0011341 (Hayes Jr. et al.), further in view of U.S.

Patent No. 6,115,709 (Gilmour et al.).

For **Claim 15**, Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) teaches: "The system of claim

14."

Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) discloses the above limitation but does not

expressly teach: "the utility defines an attribute for the shared portal configuration

comprising one of a hide and a share attribute."

With respect to Claim 15, an analogous art, Gilmour, teaches: "the utility defines

an attribute for the shared portal configuration comprising one of a hide and a share

attribute" [Gilmour, col. 17, lines 55-65 with Gilmour, col. 18, lines 45-65].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine Gilmour with Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) because both

inventions are directed towards sharing (public) or hiding (private) profile data.

Gilmour's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with

Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.)'s invention because both inventions use public and

private data. Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) discloses providing role-based views

from business web portals comprising shared portal configurations, however Schaeck

(as modified by Hayes Jr.) does not expressly disclose an attribute that designates if it

is shared or hidden. Gilmour discloses a method and system for constructing a

knowledge profile of a user having unrestricted and restricted access portions according

to respective levels of confidence of content of the portions comprising sections of profiles designated as public (shared) or private (hide) by use of a private flag (attribute).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the private flag from Gilmour and install it into the invention of Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.), thereby offering the obvious advantage of restricting access to shared configuration files, not making them shared.

Claims 18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163513 (Schaeck et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0011341 (Hayes Jr. et al.), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,026,397 (Sheppard).

For **Claim 18**, Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) teaches: "The system of claim 16."

Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "the intelligence comprises one or more of a Bayesian learning model, a Bayesian classifier, a decision tree learning model, a support vector machines, a linear regression, a non-linear regression and a neural network."

With respect to Claim 18, an analogous art, Sheppard, teaches: "the intelligence comprises one or more of a Bayesian learning model, a Bayesian classifier, a decision tree learning model, a support vector machines, a linear regression, a non-linear regression and a neural network" [Sheppard, col. 23, lines 8-11].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Sheppard with Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) because both inventions are directed towards analyzing data using a computer in the process of selection.

Sheppard's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.)'s invention because both inventions use computers. Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) discloses providing role-based views from business web portals comprising programmatic code for selection of the role of a user, however Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) does not expressly disclose using a neural network for intelligence in selecting. Sheppard discloses a data analysis system and method comprising analyzing data using a neural network on a computer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the neural network from Sheppard and install it into the invention of Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.), thereby offering the obvious advantage of having a greater chance of selecting the correct associated role of a user, error in role selection is implied in Schaeck, paragraph [0067].

For **Claim 25**, Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) teaches: "The system of claim 21, further comprising."

Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "employing one or more of a Bayesian learning model, a Bayesian classifier, a decision tree learning model, a support vector machines, a linear

regression, a non-linear regression and a neural network to facilitate selecting the shared portal configuration."

With respect to Claim 25, an analogous art, Sheppard, teaches: "employing one or more of a Bayesian learning model, a Bayesian classifier, a decision tree learning model, a support vector machines, a linear regression, a non-linear regression and a neural network to facilitate selecting the shared portal configuration" [Sheppard, col. 23, lines 8-11].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Sheppard with Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) because both inventions are directed towards analyzing data using a computer in the process of selection.

Sheppard's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.)'s invention because both inventions use computers. Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) discloses providing role-based views from business web portals comprising programmatic code for selection of the role of a user, however Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) does not expressly disclose using a neural network for intelligence in selecting. Sheppard discloses a data analysis system and method comprising analyzing data using a neural network on a computer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the neural network from Sheppard and install it into the invention of Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.), thereby offering the obvious advantage of having a

greater chance of selecting the correct associated role of a user, error in role selection is implied in Schaeck, paragraph [0067].

(10) Response to Arguments

The examiner would like to identify what appear to be typographical errors in the appellant's appeal brief. Page 5, section VII, part subsection A, recites "Rejection of Claims 1-4, 8-24, 16, 17, 20-22, 24, 26-38, and 30-38 Under 35 U.S. C. §103(a)." Based on the final Office action and statements in section VI and immediately below section VII, part subsection A, it appears that the appellant intended, "Rejection of Claims 1-4, ~~8-24~~8-14, 16, 17, 20-22, 24, ~~26-38~~26-28, and 30-38 Under 35 U.S.C. §10~~3~~2(a) and 35 U.S.C. §102(e)."

As to the appellant's arguments with respect to exemplary Claim 1 (including Claims 12, 21, 26, 33, and 34) for the prior art(s) allegedly not teaching "a system and method that employs one or more shared access profiles to interact with at least one networked device. The shared profiles are customized to delineate at least one of access and administrative privileges to that at least one networked device. A user interface employs the shared access profile to provide users having similar roles with selective access to the at least one networked device," the examiner respectfully disagrees.

First, as to the argument that Schaeck doesn't teach a system and method, the examiner submits that this is taught in at least Schaeck's claims 1 and 11 claiming a method and system, respectively.

Sceond, as to the argument that Schaeck doesn't teach shared access profiles,

the examiner submits that this is taught as originally cited in at least paragraphs [0022]

and [0067]. When considering the reference as a whole, roles in the reference are

access profiles in that they dictate access to information and they are associated with a

profile. Paragraph [0066] teaches this by stating:

> "For example, users may have a number of roles which
> determine their credentials for a specific class of operations.
> A person who is a manager might be allowed to view the
> personnel records of his employees when acting in his
> manager role, as one example, whereas he might not be
> allowed to use this same operation to see his own personnel
> record when acting in his role of an employee."

Paragraph [0022] teaches in its entirety (important parts underlined) "Preferably, the

user role is stored in a user profile associated with the user, and the user role is

determined using the user's identification credentials."

Given this teaching, a profile from Schaeck is envisioned as:

User Profile

Attribute (Role) – identification credentials

Paragraph [0067] teaches that different roles for a user can exist in one profile in

that the user can login as either employee or admin with (important parts underlined):

> [0067] Preferred embodiments of the present invention build
> on this concept, and extend the role-based processing in
> order to provide multiple views into a business web,
> according to the present invention. In preferred
> embodiments, the specification of the role that corresponds
> to the user's current log-on status is stored as an attribute of
> the user's profile. For example, when a systems
> administrator logs on with his/her administrative identifier
> and password, these values will preferably identify a user

profile where the user's role is "admin" (or some semantic
equivalent). If this same person logs on with another
identifier, such as a regular employee identifier, then that
identifier and password preferably identify a different user
profile record having a different user role. The user's profile
is preferably accessed using the provisioning interface. (In
alternative embodiments, the role information may be stored
elsewhere, and/or may be accessed using methods provided
in an interface other than the provisioning interface, including
a dedicated "Roles" interface.)

Given this further teaching, a profile from Schaeck is further envisioned as:

User Profile

Attribute (Role 1) – identification credentials 1
...
Attribute (Role N) – identification credentials N

The series of attribute roles in the profile make different records of roles within the user

profile. When the user chooses which role to log in as (e.g. employee or admin (a user

with 2 roles)) as defined by the roles associated credentials, the user role/access profile

is selected from a different (from the other role) user profile record/attribute. A different

user **profile record/attribute** is not a different user **profile** as seen from the picture

above. When the user chooses the role to login as, the same user (and thus profile

(since users are associated with their profiles in the reference)) is being used, merely a

different role/record/attribute within that profile is being used. The different user profile

role/record/attribute identifies different identification credentials.

Additionally, as an alternative responses to the argument above, paragraph

[0043] teaches (important part underlined):

[0043] It is expected by the present inventors that significant advantages can be realized by providing role-specific views into the value chains, where the multiple views will be based on the services and/or information which are relevant to a particular role. The present invention is directed toward providing these role-specific views for aggregated services. It will be appreciated by those familiar with the art that participants may be authenticated by disparate security systems which are not managed by a central authority. Thus, it is assumed that both authentication and credential acquisition occurs in a federated manner. Referring again to the shopping example, along with the illustration provided in FIG. 2, users 240 who have the role of administrator might be allowed to create a composite shopping service, and to add or delete services from the composite service. For example, the administrator might add a customer feedback sub-service (not shown in FIG. 2). Users 220 who have the role of consumer, on the other hand, might be provided a view which limits them to browsing items which can be purchased and placing orders--and which perhaps gives them access to information about their previously-placed orders. Users 270 with a role such as "business management" might be allowed to make various types of changes to the composite service (or to its sub-services), such as selecting the providers of the sub-services, changing prices of items offered for sale, modifying delivery agreements or other types of trading partner agreements, and so forth.

Paragraph [0043] teaches that multiple users may have the same role (e.g. of consumer). The users above having the same role of consumer can be construed as sharing an access profile since they both share/have the same role of consumer.

Paragraph [0047] then teaches (important part underlined):

[0047] To provide role-based views for business webs which may integrate services from a number of different sources, it is necessary to be able to automatically and dynamically "federate" or join the heterogeneous user profile information they may use. The exchange of profile information must be done in real time so that user roles can be seamlessly

determined, and an appropriate view can be presented
which aggregates content appropriate for that role.
Furthermore, it is desirable to provide this user profile
information using a single sign-on approach, whereby
identifying information obtained when a user begins to use a
portal can be programmatically obtained and used by sub-
services of an aggregated service, because requiring users
to identify themselves repeatedly during the course of a
particular service would likely cause user frustration and
would be time-consuming and inefficient. The present
invention provides a solution for these requirements, and
leverages a number of open industry standard technologies
in doing so, as will be described.

Paragraph [0047] teaches that profile information (such as roles (since roles are profile

information as identified above)) are joined when they contain the same

(heterogeneous) information. This creates a separate teaching that can be construed

as teaching shared access profiles since the users above having the same role of

consumer are really using a joined (and thus shared) role of consumer. This should be

more than adequate in teaching the argument of "a single shared access profile is used

by multiple users" on page 5 of the appeal brief even though that argument is not

explicitly claimed subject matter.

Third, as to the argument that Schaeck does not teach that the shared profiles

are to interact with at least one networked device, the examiner submits that this is

taught as originally cited in at least paragraphs [0022] and [0067]. The roles correspond

to accessing a networked device (e.g. web server/portal) since these roles are

employed in web services (see paragraph [0064], or the mere title of Schaeck).

Fourth, as to the argument that Schaeck does not teach that the shared profiles

are customized to delineate at least one of access and administrative privileges to that

at least one networked device, the examiner submits that this is taught as originally

cited in at least paragraphs [0022] and [0067] (fully cited above). Specifically,

paragraph [0067] teaches customized access with the employee role, and it teaches

administrative privileges with the administrative role. Having roles (e.g.

employee/admin) with customized different access privileges is customizing access to

at least one network device. Also, having a role of admin is delineating at least

administrative privileges to at least one network device.

Finally, as to the argument that Schaeck allegedly does not teach "a user

interface employs the shared access profile to provide users having similar roles with

selective access to the at least one networked device," the examiner respectfully

disagrees. Fig. 7 shows that a user must interface exist since information is presented

to the user (e.g. blocks 700 and 760). The information presented is based on what role/

shared access profile they are currently using/employing (block 760). The "selective

access to the networked device" limitation was shown as being taught above with the

different roles (e.g. employee role) to the web services networked device. As for the

"users having similar roles" limitation, the examiner submits that this is taught as

originally cited in at least paragraphs [0022] and [0067]. Specifically, paragraph [0067]

teaches that a user can have an employee role. In order to meet the limitation, the

reference must have multiple users having a similar role. Paragraph [0066] specifically

teaches that a manager, for instance, will have employees. These employees will have

their own employee role, thus meeting the limitation of "users having similar roles."

Additionally, in showing that multiple users can have the same role, paragraph [0043]

teaches "User**s** 220 who have the role consumer..." (emphasis added).

The other claims argued merely because of a dependency on a previously

argued claim(s) in the appeal brief presented to the examiner, filed February 27th 2007,

are moot in view of the examiner's interpretation of the claims and art and are still

considered rejected based on their respective rejections above.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the

Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Brent Stace

Conferees:

Apu M. Mofiz

JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Eddie Lee

EDDIE C. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER